WO 1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 8 Victor Bigman, No. CV-16-8122-PCT-JAT 9 CR-11-8156-PCT-JAT 10 Movant/Defendant, **ORDER** 11 v. 12 USA. 13 Respondent/Plaintiff. 14 Pending before the Court is Movant's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct 15 Sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Doc. 1). The Magistrate Judge issued a Report 16 and Recommendation (R&R) (Doc. 13) recommending that the Motion be denied. 17 Neither party has filed objections to the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby 18 accepts the R&R. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (finding that district 19 courts are not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the 20 subject of an objection" (emphasis added)); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 21 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) ("statute makes it clear that the district judge must review 22 the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but 23 not otherwise" (emphasis in original)); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F.Supp.2d 24 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003). 25 Accordingly, 26 **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 27 13) is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED; 28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Movant's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Doc. 1) is DENIED WITH PREJUDICE; and the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that a Certificate of Appealability and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal are denied because jurists of reason would not find the Court's procedural decision debatable or wrong.

Dated this 10th day of May, 2017.

James A. Teilborg

Senior United States District Judge